

REMARKS

Claims 50-69 remain in this application, with claims 50-58, 61-62, 64, 66 and 68-69 amended by this response. Support for the amendments to claim 50 may be found, among other places, at fig. 6A-6D and the accompanying discussion on pp. 29-35 of the application. The amendments to claims 50-58, 61-62, 64, 66 and 68-69 generally make these claims consistent with claim 50 as amended and/or adopt alternative phraseology less likely to be considered as defining “non-functional descriptive material” or “not objectively verifiable subject matter.” Support for these amendments may readily be found in various places in the voluminous and detailed specification.

The Decision on Appeal dated February 25, 2008 set forth a new ground of rejection for claim 50: claim 50 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Rose (US 5,724,567). This new ground is respectfully traversed. The rejection relies on refusing to give patentable weight to certain claim elements, namely “a defined topic of information, posts of information from users” or to “the user ratings signifying relevance of respective ones of the posts and of the remote information resources to the defined topic.” Decision, p. 4-6. The Decision on Appeal found that such elements were non-functional descriptive material or “not objectively verifiable subject matter,” respectively. *Id.* Without addressing the merits of Board’s findings, claim 50 has been amended to more clearly recite these elements in a way that must be given patentable weight as functional computer-implemented actions. Accordingly, the amendments clearly distinguish claim 50 over Rose.

For example, Rose fails to disclose or suggest, as defined by claim 50:

- serving a defined topic for discussion to a plurality of remote clients over the wide area network, identified as the defined topic for an integrated information resource;
- receiving information posts responsive to the defined topic from the plurality of remote clients;
- integrating the defined topic, the information posts, and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources each containing information related to the defined topic, to provide the

integrated information resource, the plurality of links being distinct from the information posts;

serving user-interface objects for rating relevance of respective ones of the information posts and of the plurality of links to the defined topic with the integrated information resource to the plurality of remote clients;

receiving user ratings from the plurality of remote clients responsive to the serving of the user-interface objects;

aggregating the user ratings to provide aggregate relevance ratings data; and

publishing the aggregate relevance ratings data with the posts of information and with the plurality of links to the plurality of remote clients as indicating user-rated relevance of respective ones of the posts and of the remote information resources to the defined topic.

In contrast, Rose discloses storing messages in an unstructured database (col. 4:7-25) and using a “user profile” to provide a “list of ranked messages.” Col. 4:40-47. Essentially, Rose teaches that “[a] prediction of a user’s likely interest in a particular document is based on the similarity between the document’s vector and the user’s profile vector.” Col. 6:52-54. Rose teaches also that prediction of a user’s interest in a document may also be “based upon a correlation with the indications provided by other users.” Col. 6:62-64. Rose teaches that it is preferred to use “a combination of content-based and correlation-based prediction . . . to rank the relevance of each item of information.” Col. 7:50-53. Rose therefore discloses ranking information using predictive measures that invariably involve comparisons with a user profile. In “content-based” prediction, the comparison is between “the document’s vector and the user’s profile vector.” Col. 6:52-54. In “correlation-based prediction” the comparison is between the user’s profile and profiles of other users that have provided feedback. Col. 7:10-37. In every case disclosed by Rose, the “list of ranked messages” is therefore inherently personalized using the requesting user’s profile. Thus, the disclosure of Rose differs from the subject matter of claim 50, in several different respects.

For example, Rose fails to disclose or suggest:

serving a defined topic for discussion to a plurality of remote clients over the wide area network, identified as the defined topic for an integrated information resource;

as defined by claim 50. This action is not disclosed by Rose, and would not be inherently performed in a system for providing personalized ranked lists as disclosed by Rose. It is simply outside of the scope of anything contemplated by Rose.

Likewise, Rose fails to disclose or suggest:

receiving information posts responsive to the defined topic from the plurality of remote clients;

as further defined by claim 50. Rose fails to disclose receiving information posts that are “responsive to the defined topic” that is served for discussion to “[the] plurality of remote clients.”

Additionally, Rose fails to disclose or suggest:

integrating the defined topic, the information posts, and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources each containing information related to the defined topic, to provide the integrated information resource, the plurality of links being distinct from the information posts; [and]

serving user-interface objects for rating relevance of respective ones of the information posts and of the plurality of links to the defined topic with the integrated information resource to the plurality of remote clients.

As defined by claim 50, the “user-interface objects” are “served with the integrated information resource to the plurality of remote clients.” The integrated information resource, in turn, is provided by “integrating the defined topic, the information posts, and a plurality of links to respective different remote information resources each containing information related to the defined topic.” Therefore, the personalized ranked list as disclosed by Rose cannot read on the claimed integrated information resource. The personalized ranked list of Rose is not served “to the plurality of remote clients” from which “information posts responsive to the defined topic” have been received. Instead, it is served only to the user that requests it. Col. 4:26-43.

While Rose is deficient as to claim 50 in other respects as well, the foregoing discussion should be more than enough to demonstrate that Rose does not anticipate claim 50. Claims 51-69 should also be allowable, as depending from an allowable base claim.

The arguments presented herein are sufficient to fully traverse the rejection based on new grounds of rejections set forth in the Decision on Appeal. Therefore, Applicants have not presented all possible arguments, and may not have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as may be found in the record. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to waive such arguments or indicate concurrence with such characterizations.

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50-69 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. If it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicant encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 25, 2008

/Jonathan Jaech/
Jonathan Jaech
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 41,091

CUSTOMER
NUMBER

58688

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
355 South Grand Avenue
Suite 3150
Los Angeles, CA 90071-1560
(213) 787-2500